

Third staff draft strategic plan and thoughts re fourth staff draft

John Kirlin
August 21, 2008

Strategic plan process steps

- Vision adopted by Task Force – November 2007
- January – May 2008: 10 days of TF meetings, work groups and Stakeholder Coordination Group focused on preparing materials; consultants and staff supporting
- First staff draft strategic plan – June 26-27
- Second staff draft – July 17-18 (modest changes)
- Third staff draft – August 21-22 (major restructuring, some new sections added, more details)
- Fourth staff draft – September 18-19
- Fifth staff draft and action by TF – October 18-19
- Contributions of suggested improvements by web site comment line, email, hard copy, panels at TF meetings, public comment period
- “Real time” science assessment of drafts
- DV Committee action – November and December 2008

Challenges to overcome in drafting staff strategic plan

- Complex issues with large stakes, conflict among interests, and substantial uncertainties about causes and tools – “wicked problems”
- Tension among three aspirations for strategic plan:
 - Effective messages: “sing”
 - Performance targets
 - Check list/action items
- Vision provides a foundation, especially re value choices, but not a structure

Substantial restructuring

- Several efforts to structure around the strategies alone not successful – needed detail appears to preclude effective thematic messages
- New structure:
 - Expanded introduction and context seek to inform and propel
 - Four key themes are introduced
 - “Integrated” discussion of 18 strategies
 - Reporting progress: eight indicators and many performance measures (does “hide” some clear metrics, such as 100,000 acres managed for eco purposes)
 - Phasing (incomplete): includes 6 first steps
 - Strategy descriptions, each linked to Vision recommendation and performance measures – substantial changes in most strategies, mostly elaboration of ideas present earlier

Illustrative strategies

- Panels today re strategies 4 and 13
- # 1: Vastly improve the efficient use of water (pages 31-34)
- # 6: Restore extensive interconnected habitats (pages 46-48)
- # 11: Designate the Delta as a unique and valued place (pages 60-63)
- #15: Create a new governance system to manage the co-equal values and other state interests in the Delta (pages 72-82)

Issues attracting attention

- Governance (including new institutions proposed and roles for existing state and local entities)
- Water rights, reasonable use and public trust
- Delta impacts (social, economic, cultural + participation)
- Ecosystem revitalization (large scale; who pays)
- Impacts on other interests (e.g., water treatment)
- Finance (asking for more information)
- Regional self sufficiency and conservation (how achieve? recognize regional variations?)
- Articulation with BDCP and other policies

Analyses of CALFED governance identify need for leadership

- Little Hoover Commission (November 2005) - clarify roles and provide “consolidated executive leadership” and a statewide water strategy
- KPMG (December 2005 - March 2006) – recommends changed organizational structure, including Executive Leadership Council, conceptual business practices and technology
- CALFED (April 2006) – 10 year action plan, proposes “Executive leadership council” composed of directors of relevant state and federal agencies and stakeholders

Little Hoover Commission

Still IMPERILED, *Still* IMPORTANT

- CALFED authority diffused and disconnected.
- CALFED could not discipline multi-agency focus.
- CBDA lacked capacity to resolve remaining issues.
- CBDA board burdened with conflicts.

Still IMPERILED
Still IMPORTANT

Note: this report is 112 pages long

Little Hoover Recommendations

- Sustainable Delta plan, comprehensive state plan
- Management functions in management structure.
- Performance management to focus and coordinate efforts.
- Broad public involvement, state advisory committee, conflict resolution.
- Legislative role: clear direction, oversight.

TF decisions re staff draft # 4

- Determine TF “comfort” with main ideas of staff draft strategic plan; identify any omissions or changes
- Refine and/or revise structure:
 - Refine current structure by ??
 - Restructure by organizing the 18 strategies “under” the six initiatives on pages 29-30
 - Clearly separate a strategic plan from an “action” plan, putting much detail in the later
 - Other revision of structure ???
 - In any of the above, add near term actions and programmatic elements

Friday

- “Walk through” the third staff draft; I recommend most time on “substantive” recommendations in strategies
- Staff and consultants who worked on various sections ready to discuss issues and answer questions, but not to “present”
- TF direction to staff, including both structure and substance